

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/408,068	•	09/29/1999	ROGER SHEALY	42655/214299	3547
23370	7590	03/27/2003			
JOHN S. P		•	EXAMINER		
1100 PEAC	HTREE S	KTON, LLP TREET	BECKER, DREW E		
SUITE 2800 ATLANTA,		09		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•				1761	

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.		Applicant(s)					
		09/408,068		SHEALY, ROGER					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
		Drew E Becker		1761					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover	sheet with the co	orrespondence address	;				
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failur - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issues of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing	36(a) In no event, howe within the statutory minivill apply and will expire so cause the application to	ver, may a reply be time mum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from the become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely ne mailing date of this commun (35 U S C. § 133)	ication				
Status	d patent term adjustment See 37 CFR 1 704(b)								
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 L	December 2002							
2a)	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-fir	nal.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
•	on of Claims								
·—	4) Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.								
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.									
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.								
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
,	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	r election requirer	ment.						
• •	On Fapers The specification is objected to by the Examine	r							
<i>'</i> —	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accept		ad to by the Exam	niner					
10)[_]	Applicant may not request that any objection to the								
11) 🗆 -	The proposed drawing correction filed on								
,	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep								
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.									
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
,	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.								
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bulee the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 1	7.2(a)).		е				
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti				ication).				
) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti								
Attachmen									
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5)		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152					

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. The request filed on August 13, 2002 for an RCE based on parent Application No. 09/408,068 is acceptable and an RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 5 recites a "product multiplier". There does not appear to be any disclosure in the specification of what this term is.
- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 6. Claim 5 recites "a product multiplier". It is not clear what a "product multiplier" is , or what value it would constitute.

Art Unit: 1761

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-4 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vaseloff et al [Pat. No. 5,186,097].

Vaseloff et al teach a cooking appliance comprising a cooking well (Figure 1, 18), a heating element (Figure 2, 26), a temperature sensing device (Figure 2, 34), a computerized controller (Figure 1, 12) comprising means for compensating for new oil by turning the heating element on and off, means for compensating for oil stratification by keeping the oil at a predetermined temperature, means for compensating for variations by sensing temperature drops and initiating a cook cycle, means for adjusting the duration of the cook cycle, and means for conducting performance checks (abstract; Figures 5A-6; column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 39), and a cooked food item (column 2, line 63). Phrases such as "according to a process comprising the steps of:" and "according to the formula" are merely preferred methods of using the apparatus, and making the claimed product, and as such are not shown patentable weight.

Art Unit: 1761

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maher Jr [Pat. No. 6,018,150].

Maher Jr teaches a method of cooking by loading food into a fryer vat (Figure 1, 8), heating the oil to a reference temperature (column 11, lines 41-49), and adjusting the cook time according to a compensation formula (column 13, lines 34-49). Maher Jr does not recite a formula of t=A^(B*\T/C). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the cook time of Maher Jr according to the above formula since this would have been done during the course of normal experimentation and optimization, since Maher Jr already included a compensation formula (column 13, lines 33-49), and since the control formula for the cooking time would have been dependent upon such factors as the type of cooking medium, the type of food, and the desired degree of cooking.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Casey et al [Pat. No. 5,942,269], Jones et al [Pat. No. 5,398,597], Cartwright et al [Pat. No. 5,352,866], Rae [Pat. No. 4,948,950], Davis et al

Art Unit: 1761

[Pat. No. 5,038,676], and Waugh [Pat. No. 4,437,159] teach fryers with computerized controls.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 703-305-0300. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 703-308-3959. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1495.

Drew E Becker Examiner Art Unit 1761

March 20, 2003